

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_120697
Title of the Manuscript:	The double inversion technique in the Somé Blaise Abbo method applied to Schrödinger-type fractional-order evolution equations
Type of the Article	Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Schrödinger-type equations are significant models in applied science. There are many applications of this kind of equation in the literature. This paper investigates the fractional-order Schrödinger-type equations in the sense of Caputo. The double inversion technique in the Somé Blaise Abbo method is used to solve the mentioned equation. The solutions obtained here should be compared to the exact solution, and also to the solutions gained in the literature.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, it should be changed to Application of the double inversion technique in the Somé Blaise Abbo method to Schrödinger-type fractional-order evolution equations.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No. Some additions should be included in the abstract. The starting sentence should include the equation. The method should be mentioned after that. So, this section should be rewritten. Notice that the abstract should not include any abbreviations.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The findings here seem to be correct. Yet, the solutions should be represented graphically. After that, the exact solution and the approximate solution should be compared to see that the approximate solution converges to the exact solution. Moreover, the significance of the method should be mentioned. The authors should explain why they use this method. In conclusion, the solutions attained here should compared to those found in the literature.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :	Yes. Yet, the references don't seem to be in the paper. It should be checked. The following paper should be cited in the manuscript: H. Gündoğdu and Ö. Gözükızıl, "Cubic nonlinear fractional Schrödinger equation with conformable derivative and its new travelling wave solutions," Journal of Applied Mathematics and Computational Mechanics, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 29-41, 2021.	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language should be corrected throughout the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	I suggest accepting the paper after the above revisions are done.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hami Gundogdu
Department, University & Country	Sakarya University, Turkey